

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 22, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks to supplement the response filed June 22, 2007. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Xu in view of Alve. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “calculating an encryption key for a protected content in the network, based at least in part on a list of the plurality of devices in the network . . . recalculating the encryption key for all the devices remaining in the network and the protected content, using the modified list; and the authorization table.” Xu fails to teach this feature. In applying Xu, the Examiner relies on column 7, lines 4-16 as allegedly teaching recalculating an encryption key. Xu teaches updating a decryption key when a multicast user terminates a session, but does not teach or suggest that the key is initially calculated “based at least in part on a list of the plurality of devices in the network” or recalculated “using the modified list.” The key is broadly referred to as being updated, with no reference to calculation, let alone calculation based on a list of devices.

Recognizing this deficiency, the Examiner cites to Alve as allegedly teaching calculating a key based on a list of devices. Alve, however, fails to teach this feature. Alve does teach a domain key, but does not teach calculating this key, or recalculating, based on a list of devices. In fact, the domain key in Alve is distributed to authorized devices so that new devices cannot play content without the domain key (paragraph [0056]). There is no discussion of calculating the domain key based on a list of devices. Thus, even if Xu and Alve are combined, the features of claim 1 do not result.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Xu in view of Alve. Claims 2-7 variously depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Xu in view of Alve for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claim 8 recites features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and is patentable over Xu in view of Alve for at least the reasons advanced with reference to

claim 1. Claims 9-15 depend from claim 8 and are considered patentable for at least the same reasons.

Further, new claims 97 and 98 recite how the encryption key is computed. These features are completely lacking in Xu and Alve.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 67232

Date: July 17, 2007